

1 Michele Besso
Northwest Justice Project
2 501 Larson Bldg., 6 South 2nd Street
Yakima, WA 98901
3 (509) 574-4234

4 Weeun Wang
Farmworker Justice
5 1126 16th Street NW, Suite 270
Washington, DC 20036

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

9 ELVIS RUIZ, FRANCISCO JAVIER
10 CASTRO and EDUARDO MARTINEZ,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 vs.

13 MAX FERNANDEZ and ANN
FERNANDEZ, a marital community;
14 and WESTERN RANGE
ASSOCIATION, a foreign nonprofit
15 organization,,
16

Defendants.

No. CV-11-3088-RMP

Plaintiffs' Response to
Defendants' Supplemented Record
to Motion to Dismiss

17 The supplemental exhibits filed by defendants in support of their motion to
18 dismiss plaintiffs' claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction have no bearing on
19 the jurisdiction of this Court. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over
20 plaintiffs' federal claims raised under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the
21

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS'
SUPPLEMENTED RECORD TO MOTION TO DISMISS

1 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331
2 and supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiffs' state contract and wage claims
3 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Despite defendants' allegations of "back door
4 claims," plaintiffs have a right to enforce their contracts with defendant Fernandez
5 in a court of law quite separate and apart from any investigative actions taken by
6 the United States Department of Labor, as is clear from the explicit language in the
7 H-2A regulations recognizing that the "clearance orders" filed by employers are
8 enforceable contracts between the employer and the H-2A worker.

9 **I. THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENTS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND**
10 **H-2A WORKERS ARE ENFORCEABLE CONTRACTS**

11 The H-2A program is built around "work contracts", as defined in 20 C.F.R.
12 § 655.103 (b):

13 All the material terms and conditions of employment relating to
14 wages, hours, working conditions, and other benefits, including those
15 required by 8 U.S.C. 188, 29 CFR part 501, or this subpart. The
16 **contract** between the employer and the worker may be in the form of
17 a separate written document. In the absence of a separate written
18 **work contract** incorporating the required terms and conditions of
19 employment, agreed to by both the employer and the worker, the
20 **work contract** at a minimum will be the terms of the job order and
21 any obligations required under 8 U.S.C. 1188, 28 CFR part 501, or
this subpart. (Emphasis added)

Under the H-2A regulations, these work contracts are explicitly
contemplated as contracts between the employer and the worker, NOT between the
employer and the Department of Labor. At 20 C.F.R. §655.122, which sets out the

1 minimum benefits, wages, and working conditions that must be included in the
2 employer's job offer (such as housing, workers' compensation coverage,
3 transportation, the three-fourths guarantee, rates of pay, and deductions from pay),
4 subsection (q) requires that the employer must provide to an H-2A worker a "copy
5 of **the work contract between the employer and the worker**" in a language
6 understood by the worker. (Emphasis added) The subsection also provides that
7 "[i]n the absence of a separate, written **work contract entered into between the**
8 **employer and the worker**", the work contract will consist of the required terms of
9 the job order and the certified Application for Temporary Employment
10 Certification.

11 As previously indicated, numerous courts have confirmed that the H-2A
12 program confers upon workers enforceable contract rights. *See, e.g., Centeno-*
13 *Bernuy v. Becker Farms*, 564 F.Supp.2d 166 (W.D.N.Y. 2008); *See also Perez-*
14 *Benites v. Candy Brand*, 2011 WL 1978414 at *6 (W.D. Ark. 2011), citing *Arriaga*
15 *v. Florida Pacific Farms, L.L.C.*, 305 F.3d 1228, 1233 n.5 (11th Cir. 2002).

16 The work contracts between the parties in this case are part of the record.
17 (Ct. Rec. 28-2, pp. 47-73.) The contracts all bear the caption "Shepherd
18 Employment Agreement" and begin with the acknowledgement that the contracts
19 are between an employer and an employee: "This Shepherd Agreement this 4th
20 day of March 2009 between Fernandez Ranch, a member of the Western Range

1 Association, hereinafter referred to as the ‘Employer’ and [one of the plaintiffs],
2 hereinafter referred to as the ‘Employee’”. *Id.* at 48. The contracts are all signed
3 by both defendant Max Fernandez and by a plaintiff. *See, e.g.*, Ct. Rec. 28-2 at 49,
4 51. The contracts are devoid of any reference to the Department of Labor or any
5 administrative enforcement process; within the four corners of the documents, the
6 employer’s contractual obligations flow clearly and directly to the plaintiffs.

7 **II. PLAINTIFFS HAVE RECOURSE UNDER STATE CONTRACT LAW**
8 **REGARDLESS OF ANY ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION OF**
9 **U.S. DOL**

10 There is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that Congress intended to
11 eliminate plaintiffs’ common law state remedies to enforce the terms of these
12 explicitly created work contracts. 8 U.S.C. § 1188, the statute that sets out the
13 conditions for the admission of temporary H-2A workers, is silent on the question.
14 Significantly, the statute’s preemption clause provides only for the preemption of
15 state and local law regulating *admissibility* of nonimmigrant workers. 8 U.S.C. §
16 1188(h) (2). To establish preemption in this case, defendants must point to a clear
17 and compelling expression of congressional intent under the INA to extinguish
18 workers’ contract rights under state law, while providing no effective means of
19 redress under federal law. Defendants have not made and cannot make such a
20 showing. The Eastern District of Washington, in *Perez-Farias v. Global Horizons*,
21 No. CV-05-3061-RHW, held in response to a similar claim by an H-2A employer:

1 Where . . . the field which Congress is said to have preempted includes
2 areas that have been traditionally occupied by the States, congressional
3 intent to supersede state laws must be clear and manifest. Here, there is
4 not clear intent of Congress to occupy the field of immigration to the
5 exclusion of state regulation of labor and employment of migrant
6 workers. The Court concludes that the IRCA does not preempt
7 Plaintiff's claim for breach of contract with regard to the [H-2A]
8 clearance orders. [internal quotation and citation omitted]; 2008 WL
9 833055 at *13 (E.D.Wash., March 27, 2008), (attached hereto).

10 *See De Canas v. Bica*, 424 U.S. 351 (1976); *see also* cases cited in Plaintiffs'
11 Sur-Reply, Ct. Rec. 46.

12 **III. PLAINTIFFS HAD NO MEANS TO APPEAL THE U.S. 13 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FINDINGS**

14 In support of the claim that plaintiffs have no right of action under state
15 contract law, defendants have represented that Congress has provided H-2A
16 workers with exclusive recourse to administrative enforcement, including
17 review by the Secretary of Labor (Ct. Rec. 50, at 3, 4). Contrary to
18 defendants' representations, the administrative enforcement process provided
19 in 29 C.F.R. § 501 *et seq.* does not provide H-2A workers with any
20 opportunity for administrative review. Under this enforcement scheme, once
21 a worker has complained of work contract violations, it is completely within
DOL's discretion whether and how to conduct its investigation. 29 C.F.R. §
501.5 (a). Moreover, once DOL completes an investigation and makes a
determination, the Department notifies only the person against whom action is
being taken. 29 C.F.R. § 501.31. *See, Disadvantaged by Design: How the*

1 *Law Inhibits Agricultural Guest Workers From Enforcing Their Rights*, 18
2 Hofstra Lab. & Emp. L.J. 575, 599 (2001). The affected worker does not
3 receive notice of the determination. Therefore, the worker also does not
4 receive notice of the right to request a hearing or the time and method for
5 requesting a hearing. 29 C.F.R. § 501.32. Clearly, the administrative review
6 process provided in 29 C.F.R. § 501 *et seq.* is intended only for the use of the
7 employer or other person found to be in violation of the H-2A regulations.

8 If Congress had intended that the DOL enforcement scheme be the H-
9 2A workers' exclusive remedy for violations of their employment agreements
10 with employers, Congress would have said so clearly and explicitly and set up
11 an administrative process with meaningful procedural protections for workers.
12 In the absence of any indication of Congressional intent to strip H-2A
13 workers of their contract rights under state law, this Court should deny
14 defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims and allow plaintiffs the
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

1 opportunity to prove the merits of their claims.

2 DATED this 20th day of March, 2012.

3 Respectfully submitted,

4 NORTHWEST JUSTICE PROJECT

5 By: s/s Michele Besso
6 Michele Besso, WSBA #17423

7 FARMWORKER JUSTICE

8 By: s/s Weeun Wang
9 Weeun Wang

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11
12 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

13
14 I hereby certify that on March 20, 2012, I caused the foregoing document to
15 be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system and
16 caused it to be served by mail to the following:

17 Timothy J. Bernasek: tbernasek@dunncarney.com,

18 cschrag@dunncarney.com

19 Gary Lofland: glofland@glofland.net

20 Weeun Wang: wwang@farmworkerjustice.org

21 PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS'
SUPPLEMENTED RECORD TO MOTION TO DISMISS

1 DATED this 20th day of December, 2012.

2 By: /s/ Estella M. Del Villar

3 Estella M. Del Villar, Legal Assistant for

4 Michele Besso, WSBA #17423

5 Attorney for Plaintiffs

6 Northwest Justice Project

7 510 Larson Bldg., 6 South 2nd St.

8 Yakima, WA 98901

9 (509) 574-4234

10 Email: micheleb@nwjus